

THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

Foreign Complications—Are We Ready for Them?

From the Times. Apart from the merits and demerits of Fenianism, the speech with which "representatives of the Irish republic in America" introduced themselves the other day to President Johnson is in a certain sense suggestive. It shows with what exceeding ease this country might involve itself in formidable foreign complications. A single step, recklessly taken, might plunge us into war. We have but to recognize the "Irish Republic" as a legitimate and the Fenians as lawful belligerents to insure hot work with England. Nay, without venturing upon a formal declaration, we have only to doze a little while one batch of Fenians institute an organized invasion of Canada, or while another batch fit out a privateer to prey on ocean commerce, and forthwith we shall be at issue with England's power. Nothing could be easier, simpler, surer.

Or, without meddling with Fenianism, is it competent to this country to kindle the largest of big blazes. It would not be difficult to provoke trouble with the same power by pressing sharply the Alabama claims, or by protesting vigorously and practically against the objects and agencies which characterize the coming confederation of the neighboring provinces. A party intent upon an aggressive foreign policy might readily seize either of these questions as a ground of quarrel. Even a party not positively aggressive, but simply firm in the maintenance of the national honor, may feel itself bound to so act in regard to these questions that international unpleasantness, not to say embarrassment, may be produced. Again, the fishery question, which has been temporarily patched up, will reappear by-and-by in all its ugliness. How shall it be dealt with? Shall we permit the young confederation to dictate the terms upon which American fishermen may pursue their vocation, or shall we discard the doctrine of Nova Scotia pottingers and assert the right of our men to fish within the prohibited line? On one hand, our people will not tolerate terms which they consider both arrogant and unjust; and on the other, it were folly to talk of our rights unless we are prepared at all hazards to enforce them.

Supposititious cases of this nature might be multiplied indefinitely. Reference might be made to Mexico, to prove by what a slender thread our amicable relations with France have hung since the commencement of the Maximilian invasion. But it is not necessary to particularize. The fact is patent that this country may without much ado be called upon to assert its claims, to vindicate its rights, to defend its honor, as against European Governments. Of this contingency, this responsibility, we cannot divert ourselves, save at the cost of national humiliation. However earnestly we cultivate peace, however sincerely we strive to prevent foreign complications, we may at any time find ourselves embroiled. This is the penalty we must be content to pay as the price of national greatness.

Now, the query arises, Are we in a position that enables us to contemplate these contingencies with composure? Suppose that complications with England or France were forced upon us, are we as ready as we ought to be to encounter them? Are we—putting the question plainly—prepared for war, as the arbiter of international differences, probable or remote?

The prime element of national strength in relation to other countries is the assurance of peace among our own people. Fenianism, by its frauds and follies what they may, at least indicates England's most sensitive spot. Just now, Ireland is England's peril. The Irish difficulty is her head for the maintenance of peace with every first-class power. It weakens and endangers her, and it will continue to do so until her legislators remove the causes of Irish disaffection. In the same way, for reasons in their nature identical, this country is in no condition to meet external difficulties. We cannot hope to maintain a vigorous foreign policy so long as we are afflicted with domestic discontent; and from this we shall not be free, not only until the Union be reconstructed, but until it be so reconstructed that the peoples who were identified in interest and ambition. That result attained, we may be bold and even defiant on questions of foreign policy. Meanwhile England is not more crippled by Ireland's alienation and hostility than is this country by the condition of the Southern States. In the case of either, war would be waged at a disadvantage.

These considerations are not adduced as reasons for complying with the demands of Southern politicians. So far as they are concerned, we can neither parley nor concede. Situated as we are, the first duty is to reconstruct on a basis that will be enduring, and Congress has decided what that basis shall be. On the plan laid down, however, the work should be pushed forward, care being taken that it shall be thoroughly done, and done promptly. But if we would prevent future disaffection—if we would so reorganize the Government, and so readjust the relations of the States, that there shall be unity and lasting domestic peace—it behooves us to inflict no superfluous penalty, and to exercise no greater severity than is absolutely necessary. Confiscate sweepingly, and the United States will be burdened with an Ireland on a large scale. Irritate needlessly, exert your authority wantonly, impress the people with a conviction that they are the victims of a relentless conqueror, and puny Spain might defy the republic with impunity. Of course, the mere politicians will be dissatisfied under any scheme which the North may impose. But it is possible to separate the great body of the Southern people from the small body of Southern politicians; and the accomplishment of this object should be borne in mind when applying the reconstruction policy. If we are not prepared to forego our pretensions as a leading power, and to modify our foreign policy to suit the purposes of others, we must not neglect the opportunity of winning back the respect and attachment of the millions whom we have forcibly brought under the authority of the Union.

Something to Eat.

From the Tribune. We extend our sincerest sympathies to Mr. President Johnson. A number of hungry men have gone to Washington and laid siege to the Presidential pantries. Such a crowd of cavernous mortals has not been seen in Pennsylvania avenue since our soldiers returned from the Southern prisons. The tavern-keepers have doubled guards, and thrifty people are purchasing dogs for the protection of their den-roosts. We knew that there had been

much complaint and real suffering, but not that actual want had set in. Proud men will fast, but when it comes to starvation, pride is silent. If Lincoln had been deprived of proper nourishment, he would scarcely have fallen. A proper amount of nutriment is necessary to well-regulated Democracy. Manhattan Club is reduced to one meal per day—bacon and greens. Tammany Hall has been sold, out of sheer inanition, and it is rumored, is to be turned into a tavern or a second-hand clothes-shop, and the sleek and well-fed editor of the World subsists upon the kindness of the head of the Department of Charities and Correction. Others are not so happy. Mr. Oakley Hall, a huge feeder, and Mr. Recorder Hackett, who has scarcely found the fishing abundant, have gone to Washington as a delegation to represent the frightful condition of the faithful to the President. Mr. Morrissey, Mr. Wood, and their colleagues, have also had a meeting and an interview with the President. The meeting was at Willard's. It was painfully interesting, and the head of the Department of Charities and Correction. Others are not so happy. Mr. Oakley Hall, a huge feeder, and Mr. Recorder Hackett, who has scarcely found the fishing abundant, have gone to Washington as a delegation to represent the frightful condition of the faithful to the President. Mr. Morrissey, Mr. Wood, and their colleagues, have also had a meeting and an interview with the President. The meeting was at Willard's. It was painfully interesting, and the head of the Department of Charities and Correction. Others are not so happy.

Then it was determined to see the President; and straightway these gentlemen called upon that illustrious man. With much wisdom he had provided a lunch, which was devoured in the most ravenous manner. Then time was called by Mr. Morrissey, who said business was business, and the President was told the harrowing story. Here were eighty thousand Democrats in New York about to die, and thus increase largely the Republican majority. All from sheer want of food. Abolitionists were growing fat and sleek in most offices and customs places. "They were especially tenacious," says our correspondent, "against the policy of giving the offices to Thurlow Weed, Samuel Tilden, General Slocum, and other outsiders." We are afraid the italicized words are ironical, and we dispute them, insisting that Mr. Weed is as good a Democrat as Oakley Hall or Johnny Morrissey. The President was told that since Mr. Weed had come into the party there was no satisfying him. His rapacity was enormous. He could absorb more offices than any six Sachems in Samoy Hall, and yet crave for more. Mr. Wood had had experiences in this way; but Mr. Weed surpassed them all. Mr. Morrissey had known fellows who gorged and grabbed; but when it came to Mr. Weed he threw up the sponge. Mr. Hall's experience with thieves and burglars had enlarged his ideas of human nature, and especially of what might be called its absorbing power; but such a capacity as Mr. Weed possessed had never been known in his practice. The Recorder remarked that if Mr. Weed could only make an indictable offense, he would give him the full extent of the law; but the Legislature was in the hands of the Abolitionists. As for himself, he needed little—a ham sandwich now and then would do—but he wanted Oakley taken care of, for his necessities were greater, and it was a pity that such a genius, a man with such a head, should be reduced to writing libels and jokes in the Sunday papers. After which Mr. James Brooks arose and made a very long speech, detailing the horrors of the faithful in such a soul-stirring manner that not a dry eye was seen in the room.

We are afraid the President was not as considerate as he might have been. In the language of a *Herold* reporter, "the President seemed more guarded and cautious than ever." A delegate asked if the President would undertake to remove certain officers. To both inquiries the President simply answered "num." We pity his Excellency. He must be dreadfully embarrassed. To provide for a party is bad enough—but there is the Senate which worries him, and when he sends out his hordes they are snatched away; and above all, there is Mr. Thurlow Weed—taken into the party out of charity—taken out of the cold, and not to starve, and yet with such an appetite! With the Senate on one side, and Mr. Weed on another, no wonder the President was "num." We extend to him our sincere sympathy. He has no doubt emptied his pantries and sliced his hams, and what more can he do? To see eighty thousand Democrats on the point of death—to see starvation in the mainly forms of Morrissey and Wood, Hackett and Oakley Hall, Chanler and Brooks—to see Tammany Hall actually sold, paint, feathers, and tomahawks, for bread to eat—above all things, to think of the elegant Manhattaners eating a scanty meal from their gold plates—to think of this, and feel that we live in a Christian age, is distressing. We want to increase the Republican party, but by converting our enemies, and not starving them. There are twenty morals to be drawn, but one will do—the moral of the fairy story, which all men know, having upon a tin snail called Sankin put an old man upon his back, and undertook to carry him. We remember the unfortunate consequences. These, perhaps, were what the President was thinking about when he "simply answered num."

Mum's the Word.

From the Herald. The Congressional delegation from this city—John Morrissey, Fox, Brooks and Fernando Wood—paid a visit to President Johnson a day or two ago, and made a formal demand on behalf of their constituents for a share in the Federal offices. They claimed that, as the especial friends of the President, they are entitled to enjoy some of the good things within his gift, and complained that they had not been consulted in regard to the appointments, but had been treated as of no account. They do not seem to have impressed the President with a very high sense of the value of their support. We are told that he preserved a provoking reticence—that in reply to questions as to whether he would make certain removals and would honor the recommendations of the New York Democratic Congressmen for the office of Collector and Assessor of Internal Revenue in this city, now vacant, he "simply answered num." The only remark he did make was significant, and not without a spice of sly mischief. He wanted to know of the disinterested delegation if they supposed that the Senate would be likely to confirm the nominees recommended by Morrissey, Brooks, Wood and Fox?

There is something refreshing in the cool impudence of these sturdy beggars for office. Without a party at their backs, elected by the lowest element of the grog-shop and the gambling hell, beaten in every Northern State in the Union, and too insignificant even to be thought of in Congress, they march up to the White House, and demand to be made the brokers of the Federal patronage, generously offering as a sort of compromise to be contented with half the appointments.

We have no doubt that they would make very good use of the offices if the President should accede to their demands. Fernando Wood is well versed in the science of making patronage pay, and would realize handsomely on perquisites and shares. Fox has a number of deserving candidates in the First Ward who are really suffering since such arbitrary restrictions have been placed on emigrant

ing, baggage-smashing, and other popular callings. Brooks has a large family of hungry kids—nothing out of place, who have been looking about with their dark lanterns for employment for the last ten or twelve years. John Morrissey, who loves to do a generous action for his friends, would be pleased to push the claims of Izzy Lazarus, "Dublin Tricks," Joe Coburn, Barney Aaron, Bill Tovey, Kit Barnum, and other deserving champions. Upon the whole, we think it might be well for Andy Johnson to consider the demands of the New York delegation. Then if he should ever run for President of the United States, he may make sure of a large majority in this city than Hoffman obtained at the last November election.

The Three Barnums.

From the Herald. There are three Barnums running in the Fourth District of Connecticut for Congress. William H. Barnum, the iron dealer; P. T. Barnum, the small swindling showman; and Lewis Barnum, who claims to be a cousin of the small swindling showman. The latter is self-nominated, and stumps the State in the wake of the showman, in order to show him up in his true colors. Lewis Barnum makes some terribly severe attacks upon Barnum, the humbug, and is doing him serious injury. It is said that showman Barnum is so alarmed at the progress made by his cousin that he is about to have him arrested for libel. This will only be done to get him off the ground for the present; but if Lewis Barnum is allowed he will defeat the plot of the small swindling showman to get him out of the way. No man can be arrested or held to bail for libel under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the third Barnum can easily obtain his liberty if he should be arrested on the complaint of a self-convicted humbug. It is of course very annoying for Barnum, the showman, to be held up before the Bridgeport people in a state of nature. He cannot afford to stand examination and exposure any more than any of his fellow-humbugs could, including the Woolly Horse, the Peasey Maud, the Bearded Lady, the Petrified Horse and Rider, etc.; but he will not find it so easy to get rid of the annoyance. The people are called upon to "pay their money" at the show, and they insist upon knowing "the true nature of the beast."

The Proto-Martyr of the Pantaloon.

From the World. A cruel act of injustice has just been done to a most industrious public servant. Mr. Sanford, our Minister Resident at Brussels, very properly asked, some time ago, to be absolved from bearing a title which could only make him ridiculous in the eyes of his colleagues, since it is a notorious fact that neither at Brussels nor anywhere else has he ever been "resident." Such is the gay elasticity of his temper that life with him means locomotion, and he long since earned the sobriquet of the "diplomatic flea" by the suddenness and vivacity of his leaps from one capital of Europe to another. To have conferred upon him the title of "Minister Resident" would have been both a pretty and a proper way of recognizing his disposition as well as his services; but that title being unknown to our diplomatic hierarchy, Mr. Sanford was compelled to put his plea for accuracy in the form of a prayer for promotion. He asked to be appointed "Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary." This appointment would only have authorized him to be as busy-body as circumstances and other people's good nature would permit. But the Senate would not give it to him. After their lavish breveting of everybody who ever wore a sword or pocketed a bounty in the national army, this treatment of a diplomat as meritorious in his way as Neal Dow in battle, or Dick Busted on the bench, was certainly very scurvy. And its meanness has been made still worse by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Sumner, who on Thursday got up in the Senate, and announcing that there was "a habit among our Ministers abroad of wearing court costume on certain occasions," reported a joint resolution, which was passed, to the following effect:—

"Resolved, That all persons in the diplomatic service of the United States are prohibited from wearing any uniform or official costume not previously prescribed by Congress."

This is a fine republican look of protestation against the "diverted look" of the effete European monarchies. But it is only Mr. Sanford's thunder which Mr. Sumner has stolen. For twenty years Mr. Sanford has lived upon the renown of his lofty moral courage in appearing at the Tuileries in a pair of black pantaloon. He will go down into history as the proto-martyr of Mr. Marcy's famous order rescinding the whole embroidery business from our diplomatic schedules. And now, at the very moment when his sacrifice is erected by Mr. Sumner into a statute, he is snubbed and made little of, refused his promotion, and told to be "Minister Resident," or, in other words "to keep still!" That Senator Sumner should occupy his grave and mighty mind with a question of pantaloon, would, of itself, be surprising. But that he should plagiarize from Mr. Sanford on such a question, and, as one may say, take the bread out of the mouth of the very flea he has just caught between his thumb and his forefinger, is really deplorable. So far as concerns the abstract question itself, we have no quarrel to make either with Mr. Sumner or Mr. Marcy. When Mr. Marcy told Mr. Sanford to take the stripes off the legs of his pantaloon and the golden oakleaves from his coat, Mr. Sanford did right in obeying. And Mr. Sumner is right when he insists that there shall be as much uniformity in the uniforms of our diplomats as of our soldiers and our sailors. The sort of people whom Mr. Sumner and Mr. Seward have been sending abroad for six years past to represent us may not, for the most part, have been beautiful to behold, even in uniform; but it is dreadful to think that "guys" they would have sent out if they had been left to their own devices in the matter of dress. We have had Ministers who were perfectly capable of going to court in a second-hand costume of the "Conte di Luna," from the *Trovatore*, or in the dress of a police sergeant, or in the black frock-coat and satin waistcoat of a Western Methodist missionary, or, as really happened in one lamentable case, in the castoff coat of a Senator of the French empire. By all means let us have a diplomatic uniform, "neat but not gaudy," and let our envoys be compelled to wear it at all times when anybody is likely to be obliged to look at them. But what a wretched thing it is for Senator Sumner to have cribbed even so small and practical a thought; and what a sinful thing for him to have snubbed its proto-martyr in the very act of erasing it!

The Supplemental Reconstruction Bill.

From the Nation. The bill providing the machinery for carrying out the Reconstruction bill of the last Congress has just passed the House, with an amendment touching the proportion of the registered electors which shall be necessary to elect the conventions, and, unless the Senate should agree, the final passage of the bill will be delayed by a conference. Its provisions are such as we described in our last number, and no debate of importance took place on any of them in either the House or Senate. Mr. Howard made a strong effort to make improvements on the oath to be administered to persons voting for the delegates to the constitutional conventions, by requiring them to swear that they were "sincerely attached to the Constitution of the United States"—a provision which of course would simply have furnished one more temptation to commit perjury, without making the least addition to the security of the Constitution.

As a general and sound rule, no man should ever be legally required to swear or affirm anything as a test of fitness for any office, or for the exercise of any franchise, unless there exists some cause of proving him guilty of perjury in case he breaks his oath, or rather of knowing whether he ever breaks his oath or not. If a man promises, on oath, to support the Constitution of the United States, he fulfills his promise by being a decent citizen and letting the Constitution alone. "Supporting" a constitution consists in living quietly under it, and refusing to join in or actively opposing attempts to overthrow it. Therefore, when a man has sworn true allegiance to one, all his neighbors have the means of detecting him at once in case he breaks his oath. But when, as Mr. Sumner proposed the other day, you make a man swear to "support the diffusion of knowledge," you have no means of knowing whether he has kept his oath or not, because no definition of "support to the diffusion of knowledge" could possibly be fixed upon that would be satisfactory.

A person who swears to "support the diffusion of knowledge" by giving a small bribe, or by saying occasionally in his family circle that education improves the mind, and that knowledge is power; but it would always be impossible to find out whether he had even done this or not. So also, when you ask a man to swear that he is "sincerely attached" to the Constitution, you exact an affirmation of which you cannot either detect or punish the falsehood. If he is a loyal man, he may take the oath as often as he chooses, and cannot be punished for taking it falsely. In the Middle Ages oaths were administered very lavishly, because it was generally believed that something dreadful would happen by a special act of Providence to people who swore falsely. We do not expect anything of the kind. We rely, it is true, for the sanctity of an oath on the dread of future punishment on the part of the person taking it, but only in a very small degree, because we know, as a matter of fact, that men's conduct is influenced only very slightly, as regards the grosser offenses against morality, by the fear of penalties to be inflicted in the next world. Our main reliance is on the penalties inflicted by the Courts in this world, and we owe it to the cause of public morality not to administer oaths, on a great scale, in cases in which those who take them know that they are, if they commit perjury, safe from human justice at least.

It may be suggested that we are wasting words on this matter, inasmuch as the amendment was not adopted; and nobody who sees the extent to which some of our radical friends in Congress are disposed to rely on oath tests for the safety of this Government at the South, can help feeling that attention ought to be called by somebody to the teachings of experience and of common sense on this point. Many attempts have been made in the Old World to bolster up institutions of all kinds, political, ecclesiastical, and social, by oaths, and they have all failed. In all countries in which this plan of securing stability or safety has been resorted to, it is being abandoned in repair, after having caused an enormous amount of perjury, and made the offense seem a mere peccadillo in the eyes of the public. For us to resort to it at this day is worse than ridiculous.

As we have said before, it may be, and we believe it is, proper to exclude at present from participation in the Government all those who have, during the last five years, borne a prominent part in the attempt to overthrow it; but it is not desirable to exclude those who are not "sincerely attached to it." Our duty and interest are to make them sincerely attached to it by every means in our power, to convince them of its benefits, to interest them in its preservation. Oaths will not do this; but oaths wantonly and unnecessarily imposed may make men hate it and want to get rid of it. The oath is a capital instrument for the exclusion from a share in the Government at present, or always, of persons who have taken a certain part in the Rebellion, but as a guarantee for anybody's future good behavior, or for the present state of anybody's heart, it is worse than worthless.

Mr. Sumner moved one amendment, towards the close of the debate in the Senate, which was lost by a vote, "that the Constitution of each State shall require the establishment and maintenance of a system of common schools, open to all without regard to color." No debate appears to have taken place on this, so that we are left in ignorance of the objections of those who voted against it. But, whatever they were, we cannot but regard its failure as a great misfortune. No other opportunity may ever offer itself of overcoming that dislike or want of appreciation of popular education which has all along been the curse of the South, and which, like other Southern defects, will not, in our opinion, disappear for many a day, without some pressure or interference from without.

There may be objections to insisting that the public schools shall admit children of both colors indiscriminately, for this would probably result either in the forcible exclusion of the colored children from all schools, or the non-attendance of the white children. In trying to elevate or improve ignorant or prejudiced men and women, we have to take them as they are, with all their imperfections on their heads; and if they will not start on our road, we must be content to go a little way with them on theirs. We should prefer seeing separate schools for each color established at the South, to seeing schools for both colors which only one attended, or seeing none for either. The great object to be attained is education; the color prejudice will only be extirpated by the spread of knowledge and of Christianity.

But of the vast and overwhelming importance of starting some general system of education at the South now, and of making it an essential feature of any reconstruction plan, there can be no doubt. We have no hesitation in pronouncing the question of excluding Rebels from the polls to be of a very inferior degree of importance, though it is the only thing to which most of the majority in Con-

gress seem to give much attention. We do not hesitate to confess, once more, that we are of the number of those who think the doctrine that nothing but the common sense of an ignorant man is needed to enable him to use the ballot rightly, and that the ballot is in itself a sufficient educator or enlightener of ignorant men, or that it may not and does not prove very frequently in their hands an instrument of their own spoliation and degradation, to be a dangerous and pernicious heresy, opposed to the whole theory of democratic government, and to the principles on which the social system of the free States has been based ever since the settlement of the country. It is a doctrine imported by Southern slaveholders from English Tory manor-houses, and preached at the South through long years in the interest of slavery; and we consider its adoption by Northern preachers and politicians, under the influence of the present political excitement, as a ready means of hastening a political triumph, to be something which all intelligent and patriotic men ought to deplore and fight against.

Nevertheless, even if Congress will exact no pledge from the South on this point, although it is exacting of many others, all is not lost. As long as the Government supplies protection, both Southern whites and Southern negroes can be educated. The volunteer organizations of the North are doing a great work in this field already, and if the people will only sustain the Freedmen's Associations in the support and diffusion of their schools, we think we can promise that test oaths will, in a very few years, be of little consequence, and that the National Government will be surrounded by other and better bulwarks.

The Nutmeg State.

Editorial Correspondence of the N. Y. Independent. After looking at strange regions in the West, I have been looking once more at the familiar face of Connecticut. It is best to be on good terms with one's neighbors; so I refrain from calling Connecticut a mean State. Nevertheless, at a period when every New England heart ought to have lent its sympathy to the negro, Connecticut dealt him one of the foulest of blows. The first Northern bayonets to enter the fallen city of Richmond were carried by a black regiment from Connecticut; but on the very day of the victorious entrance of these troops, and while the air over their heads was resounding with their cheers, Connecticut white men at home were filling their ballot-boxes with votes against negro suffrage! If any single day's record of the war is more thoroughly clouded with disgrace than this, I know not where to look for it.

The blame of the ill deed belongs to the Republican party of that State—whose leaders, after having submitted the question of negro suffrage to the people, refused to advocate it during the campaign, and conspired to defeat it at the polls. A New England Senator at the time told me that he had offered to canvass Connecticut on the issue of impartial suffrage, promising to pay out of his own pocket the expenses of hiring the halls in which he should speak; but the Republican managers warned him off the ground. Moreover, we all distinctly remember how every high-minded man who hailed from Connecticut, wore a look of chagrin and mortification at any mention of that vote even six months after the election.

That one day's cowardice in a Yankee State delayed the reconstruction of the South perhaps five years! Now, on the first of April next a new struggle of parties is to take place in Connecticut. Both the giants are busy, harnessing for the battle. By common consent the two sides are nearly equally divided. Out of perhaps seventy thousand votes likely to be cast, the majority be it one way or the other, will probably not be more than five hundred. And yet, if three years ago the Connecticut Republicans had generously and justly enfranchised their two thousand colored fellow-citizens—at the fit and beautiful moment when those citizens, in the garb of soldiers, were heroically capturing Richmond—the coming victory of the first of April might be already written down as achieved while yet the battle itself is waiting to be fought.

Thus, again, it is seen that cowardice never is statesmanship. But the Union party of Connecticut seeks now honestly to undo the past, to efface the old record of shame, and to bear an unequivocal testimony in favor of justice and equality. The prospectus of the campaign demands the equal rights of all American citizens without distinction of race. Governor Hawley—whose re-election I shall toss my hat high—is a man in whose veins runs no drop of blood not loyal to the lowly. I have seen him stand strong where other men quailed. He was one of the few Northern Governors at the Southern Loyalist Convention in Philadelphia, who did not turn pale at the sight of Frederick Douglass walking arm-in-arm with a white man in a Republican procession. He is every inch a man. Let him be re-elected in his honored chair.

If Connecticut shall vote the wrong way on the 1st of April, she will reinstate Andrew Johnson to further usurpation, and reanimate the Rebellion to further defiance. A vote cast with the Democratic party of Connecticut is a plaudit to Jefferson Davis and a laurel to General Lee. There is not a Rebel in the South who does not desire to see Connecticut captured by the Copperheads. A blow against the Democracy is a blow against the Rebellion. Let it be struck as from a gauntlet of iron!

But whose rebukes Connecticut, let him honor Windham county. It was here that Putnam went into the wolf's den. It is here that Liberty rekindles her ancient fires at every successive election. It must be here that a doubtful State, always in peril, rests its hope of salvation. Let old Windham once more gird on her ancient strength, and once more win a double victory—for Connecticut and for the nation!

Meanwhile, I point to the contrast between Connecticut and Iowa. One State struggles hard for a Republican majority of five hundred; the other gives lavishly a Republican majority of fifty thousand! These contrasting figures contain a lesson which ought to be heeded by the politicians of the Nutmeg State. The lesson is this:—The leading Republicans of Iowa are bold and uncompromising men, who, not being willing to surrender principle to party, have at last carried the party up to principle. On the other hand, the leading Republicans of Connecticut (with a few illustrious exceptions) are timid and time-serving men, who have never maintained a bold allegiance to moral ideas. Connecticut will never begin to be safe till her Republican managers cease to be cowardly.

This, perhaps, is not the pleasantest kind of remark to make of a score of one's own personal acquaintances. "Am I therefore your enemy because I tell you the truth?"

WATCHES, JEWELRY, ETC.

KITCHEN & CO. JEWELERS.

S. E. Corner TENTH and CHESTNUT.

GREAT REDUCTION IN PRICES.

DIAMONDS, WATCHES, JEWELRY, SILVER-WARE, BRONZES.

ALL GOODS MARKED IN PLAIN FIGURES. WATCHES AND JEWELRY CAREFULLY REPAIRED.

Particular attention paid to Manufacturing all articles in our line.

N. RUSON Having engaged with Kitchen & Co., will be much pleased to see his friends and customers. [21 Jan



Have on hand a large and splendid assortment

DIAMONDS, WATCHES, JEWELRY, AND SILVER-WARE

OF ALL KINDS AND PRICES.

Particular attention is requested to our large stock of DIAMONDS, and the extremely low prices. BRIDAL PRESENTS made of Sterling and Standard Silver. A large assortment to select from. WATCHES repaired in the best manner, and warranted. [18 Jan

Diamonds and all precious stones bought for cash.

JOHN BOWMAN,

No. 704 ARCH Street,

PHILADELPHIA,

MANUFACTURER AND DEALER IN

SILVER AND PLATED WARE.

Our GOODS are decidedly the cheapest in the city for

TRIPLE PLATE, A NO. 1. [3 Jan

MUSICAL BOXES

Large and small sizes, playing from 2 to 12 airs, and costing from \$5 to \$20. Our assortment comprises such choice melodies as—

"Coming Thro' the Rye,"

"Robin Adair,"

"Rock Me to Sleep, Mother,"

"The Last Rose of Summer,"

"Monastery Bells," etc., etc.

Besides beautiful selections from the various Operas, I import direct, and at the lowest prices, by

FARR & BROTHER,

Importers of Watches, etc.,

113 Arch Street, No. 224 CHESTNUT St., below Fourth

WATCHES, JEWELRY.

W. W. CASSIDY,

No. 12 SOUTH SECOND STREET,

Offers an entirely new and most carefully select d

stock of AMERICAN AND GENEVA WATCHES,

JEWELRY,

SILVER-WARE, AND FANCY ARTICLES OF

EVERY DESCRIPTION, suitable for

BRID L OR HOLIDAY PRESENTS.

An examination will show my stock to be unsurpassed in quality and cheapness. Particular attention paid to repairing. [8 Jan

C. RUSSELL & CO.,

No. 22 NORTH SIXTH STREET,

Have just received an invoice of

FRENCH MANTEL CLOCKS.

Manufactured to their order in Paris.

Also, a few INFERNAL ORCHESTRA CLOCKS, with side pieces, which they offer lower than the same goods can be purchased in the city. [3 Jan

HENRY HARPER,

No. 520 ARCH Street,

Manufacturer and Dealer in

WATCHES,

FINE JEWELRY,

SILVER-PLATED WARE, AND

SOLID SILVER-WARE.

AWNINGS, ETC.

AWNINGS! A W N I N G S!

MILDEW-PROOF A W N I N G S.

W. F. SHEIBLE,

No. 49 South THIRD Street,

AND

No. 31 South SIXTH Street,

Manufacturer of MILDEW-PROOF A W N I N G S, VERANDAS, FLAGS, BAGS, TENTS, and WAGON COVERS.

Stencil Cutting and Canvas Printing. [23 Mar

AWNINGS, WAGON COVERS, BAGS, ETC.

If you want an EXTRA AWNING VERY CHEAP, let our Awning Makers take the measure, and make it from a lot of 1500 Hospital Tents lately purchased by us, many of which are new, and the best 1200. Also, Government Saddles and Harness of all kinds, etc., etc.

PITKINS & CO.,

812 1/2 No. 37 and 39 N. FROST Street.

REMOVAL.

DEER & SEARS REMOVED TO NO. 1 PRUNES STREET.—DEER & SEARS, formerly of Goldsmith's Hall, Library street, have removed to No. 412 PRUNES STREET, between Fourth and Fifth streets, where they will continue their Manufactory of Gold Chains, Bracelets, etc., in every variety. Also, a large assortment of Gold, Silver, and Copper. Old gold and silver bought. [19 Jan

FLORIST

AND

Preserver of Natural Flowers,